



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

his own season, and follow his own plan, of emancipating the Catholics; and serving his dear country!

H—s.

To the Proprietors of the Belfast Magazine.

Gentlemen,

I was really astonished at the very inaccurate account which you gave in your Magazine for May, of the riots and burglaries which have occurred in and about Kilkeel. I am perfectly disinterested, "nullius addictus jurare in verba magistri," and I here propose to give you a true, unvarnished account, neither garbling circumstances, nor exaggerating nor extenuating facts; at the same time I will trace the evil to its true source, without going too far back, "nec bellum Trojanum gēno incipiat ab ovo."

The Orangemen, who here constitute the yeomanry of the country (from which every Catholic is excluded, let his character be ever so good, and in which every ruffian is sure to find arms and ammunition, upon the sole condition, that he is not a Catholic,) have, for a long series of time, infested the district; by patrolling the roads at night with their arms, abusing the individuals whom they meet, and sometimes by firing into houses; all did not provoke the unarmed, unprotected Catholic to retaliation in any instance, as far as I can discover. But on the 22d of last December, they assumed a more formidable aspect (and in all I assert, I defy contradiction,) they came into the town of Kilkeel about eight o'clock in the evening, having their red coats turned, and after clearing the streets, they deliberately began, with circumstances of the most cowardly, ferocious barbarity, to wreck the house of a Catholic who was giving them no offence, which indeed no one attempted to do; and after firing about thirty ball cartridges into it, they retired with expressions of fanaticism, shocking to be heard, degrading to human nature, and disgraceful to Christianity. Fortunately no lives were lost, though there were at the time, seven or eight persons in the house; no inquiry was ever made about this transaction; nor were any steps taken to detect the guilty, or to protect the innocent. About the same time another Catholic house was also

wrecked, which was equally overlooked with the former; but these, and many other little exploits of this description, were mere preludes to the grand drama which was to be acted on the 9th of February.

It appeared that in the afternoon of the 9th of February, Newel walked up and down the street several times, declaring that he could beat any Papist in the town, (*in this country it seems, that insulting language towards a Papist, does not constitute any offence;*) Cunningham, who happened to be in the street, said he could beat any Newel, upon which Newel came up close to him, in order to provoke him, and Cunningham did strike him. After a short contest Newel was beaten, and he and his party ran off towards their depot of arms, which was in McKibbin's, pursued by their opponents, who began to throw stones at the house; it is said by some, that they fired first out of the house, before any stones were thrown; and by others, the reverse is asserted; however, it is certain, that they had their guns prepared for the purpose, as they fired almost simultaneously with their entering the house. In a short time, the people, panic-struck, universally retired home, and left the town; all of course was quiet, until the Orangemen, under the cover of night, reappeared with their arms, and were employed for about five hours in wrecking the houses of the Catholics, and in destroying and plundering their property: they fired into several houses, one Catholic was wounded, and deprived thereby for ever, of the use of his arm. I never heard of a Protestant woman being wounded by a bullet, until I read it in your Magazine. I heard of an old woman receiving a hurt in her nose, who was carrying stones in her apron, to some Orangemen who were stationed on this side of the bridge, as it is called, and who were throwing them very diligently among the people. The damages done to the houses, but not the robberies, have been mostly ascertained; here your correspondent is right, but I cannot discover that any arrangement has been made, whereby the poor people may receive compensation for the loss of their property; I am informed that the motion was negatived in Vestry. But your correspondent is worse than incorrect, when he says that a number of Catholics were collected in the town, and taken into a neighbouring back-yard, where spirits

were distributed among them, and that they then proceeded over the bridge in appearance, for riotous purposes; if this was true, I would consider that the severest infliction of the law would be an inadequate punishment for such a vile and base transaction; but your correspondent knew, that it was a fabrication of the Orange party, for the purpose of palliating their own nefarious deeds. Did he not know that every nerve was strained, in order to make out some story, such as this, and that every attempt proved completely abortive? Besides, surely no one will say that a certain magistrate, living not one hundred miles from Lord Kilmurry's stables, would neglect to expose such a fact to public view, if it had any, even the most sandy foundation! And though I am so far a Quaker, that "I intermeddle not in politics," still I must enter my honest protest against selecting magistrates from among the lowest and meanest of the people. They *may* be useful on some vile and mean occasions; but certainly when invested with power, they are very pernicious to the community. Did not your correspondent know, that the question about the back-yard employed the magistrates for two days, and that it was clearly discovered, that the persons in the yard alluded to, were peaceably employed in transacting their own market business, which is customary in said yard, and that not one of them was over the bridge, or implicated in any riot? Supposing that this story was true, would your correspondent assert, that the Orangemen were justified in wrecking and robbing the dwellings of the peaceable inhabitants, against whom there was no crime, nor even the colour of crime? For it is certain, that no individual whose house was wrecked, had taken a share in any riot whatever; they wished for no disturbance, but they were anxious to live in peace, and to be permitted to attend to their honest industry; this recalls to my mind, the morality of some Indian tribes, who, if injured by an European, are sure to inflict vengeance afterwards, upon the first European with whom they meet.

On the general conduct of magistrates, you will allow me to decline making any comment; there are four of them *here*, three of whom are the yeomanry captains; one of the said three is some sort of a revenue officer, the Rector, Mr. Warring, is the fourth; he is a most excellent magistrate. Three of the magis-

trates live not much more than a mile from the town, and Moore's Lieutenant lives in the town. Colonel Mathews was the only one, who during the wrecking came into town, and I am certain he retired, impressed with the idea, that his interference would not be effectual in suppressing it. I think that this man's motives and actions have been much misrepresented, and I am sure, to use an awkward but expressive phrase, that the saddle has not been put upon the right horse. Any one who knew the Colonel, would instantly say of him, what Tacitus formerly said of Agricola, "*bonum virum facile dixeris, magnum libenter.*"

Yours sincerely,

A PHILANTHROPIST.

Mourne Mountains, June the 14th, 1814.

To the Proprietors of the Belfast Magazine.

GENTLEMEN,

The editor of the Belfast News-letter has once more evinced his hostility to your respectable work, by giving insertion to one of the most virulently abusive papers which has ever yet disgraced any public print; for within the same bounds I think it would be impossible in any other case to shew as many abusive epithets as have been applied to you and your correspondents by this candidate for St. Giles'. Surely, gentlemen, this man must have lost his senses, or otherwise he is grown desperate at the sinking state of his unfortunate bantling, which has already been brought almost to ruin by the intemperate effusions which have proceeded from the pen of his friend and patron Crito-Philo-Crito; or the present article is a fulmination issuing from the same quarter, in revenge for the contempt he has been thrown into by the essays which have appeared against him in the Magazine.

To shew the extreme weakness of your adversaries, and how little reason they are capable of bringing against you, I really think, in justice to yourselves, you should publish the article alluded to on the cover of the next Magazine. To be attacked by such a writer is honourable to you. It proves that the truths you promulgate are sorely biting to the wicked, and it proves the strength of the arguments used, inasmuch as they are in

no way attempted to be controverted, but by unmeaning abuse, even by those to whom they are disagreeable, and who would no doubt willingly refute them if they were able, whether the writers should avow them or not. He holds out a challenge for "you and your correspondents to give to the public your names and places of abode, and then he will shew that your retrospect of politics would disgrace a school-boy, and that your correspondents have basely misrepresented and traduced the character and conduct of public bodies, and the words and actions of highly respectable individuals." Safely does he hold out such a challenge; as he is well convinced, from the sample he has given of his disposition, and his literary abilities, that no correspondent of yours should demean himself so far as to attend to it. The knowledge of his name, or his residence, is not worth a moment's thought. He has enumerated no less than 21 of your correspondents, upon whom, with you, he calls to come forward and avow their names, surnames, and places of abode—or what? What, gentlemen, will be the consequence? Why, that your retrospect of politics shall get leave to pass without being shewn by him to be disgraceful to the pen of a school-boy, and the "malignant defamation" of the character and conduct of public bodies, and individuals, and the "errors in point of fact" committed by your correspondents, will be suffered to remain undetected and unexposed by this flaming advocate for peace and good order. Not another word will he say on the subject of all these enormities, unless 21 of your correspondents tell him their names, and where they live, and that you also gratify him in the same way. For my own part, if any of my essays were attacked by a man of cool and sober reasoning, by a man who had the manners of a gentleman, and to whom it appeared that the search after truth was really an object, I would not have the smallest objection to give him every satisfaction he should demand upon that head; but who would commit himself to such an incendiary, that appears to be devoid of reason and common sense; and who, one may reasonably suspect, is one of those blood-suckers that wish only for an opportunity of wreaking his vengeance on any man who is hardy enough to give his sentiments to the public.

What fine game for the Orangemen to hunt on the 12th of next month, would 21 of the Magazine writers be! Does Mr. "Somebody" really take us for such flats as to put that in his power? No; he never expected it; but the gasconade he holds out, he thinks will pass off well with those of his party, and his ribaldry will satisfy the Editor of the Belfast News-Letter for a defence of him and his wretched paper.*

If this "salamander," who deals more in abuse than common sense, found any man or body of men traduced or misrepresented, why not refute the calumniator at once? Why not stand forward in the language of truth, and in terms of reason and argument contradict the statements, and refute the arguments without waiting for the real names of the slanderers? Why suffer the calumnies to remain uncontradicted, because the name is unknown? Can truth be the less true, because the name of the writer is a secret, or is calumny the less injurious because the calumniator is anonymous? Or is it only necessary to refute the arguments of the writer who is known, and that all should pass unnoticed which comes from persons unknown. The celebrated Junius was never known, yet his assertions were contradicted by those who signed their real names, and his reasoning replied to, though he declined the challenge of coming forward with his name. Now I would challenge "Somebody" to take up some of the essays, or some of the Political Prospects, and let us see a specimen of his reasoning. We have had already enough of his abuse; let us see where public bodies or individuals have been traduced, and where facts have been misstated, and this he may do under the fictitious signature of "Somebody", or Nobody, or any other signature he may choose. For indeed he may believe me until he shews us something more than we have seen from him yet, either as Crito, Philo-Crito, "Somebody", Christianus, Veritas, or, a Methodist; his real name

* The gross partiality of this editor, is conspicuous in his not inserting the detailed report of Sir Henry Parnell's speech, on presenting the Anti-Orange petitions in his paper. The Editor of the Chronicle acted in a different, and honourable manner.

is perfectly uninteresting, and not worth inquiring after.

Gentlemen, your Magazine according to Mr. "Somebody," is an object of general contempt, and has the character of "despicable stamped upon it:" it is matter of astonishment then, that this very consequential writer, who attaches such immense importance to the knowledge of his name and character, should think it worth his attention, and that he has not suffered it to fall into oblivion, buried in its own insignificance, or as he blunderingly says, "again to die a natural death." If it is so generally contemptible and so very despicable, it is harmless, for no person can be influenced by that which is contemptible to them. Is he not therefore raising it into consequence and importance by condescending to notice it? Or is he not rather to be compared to a choleric man, who always swore he was quite cool, when he was in the height of passion, and who expressed his contempt for the object which was really of such consequence to him as to excite his cholera.

I am, &c.

AN IRISHMAN.

Belfast, 21st June, 1814.

To the Proprietors of the Belfast Magazine.

Gentlemen,

I request you may insert in your valuable and independent miscellany, the following, on the truth of which you may rely.

At a public dinner in —, on Saturday 4th June, being the King's birth-day, a number of gentlemen attended to express *their loyalty and attachment to the laws, &c. &c.* A neighbouring magistrate and captain of Yeomanry, it is also unnecessary to say an Orangeman also, was called to the chair, and a number of loyal toasts given. On its being hinted that the health of the Lord Lieutenant should be drank, the chairman replied that he omitted it *on purpose through mistake.* The worthy chairman, who was then unacquainted with the politics of Lord Whitworth, as he was ignorant that the Catholic Board had been suppressed on the 3d, by proclamation, at present regrets his great neglect. It would be charitable of you, gentlemen, to write a few words to console him; and to hint that he may repair his mistake by drinking the Lord Lieutenant and Councils' health in Innishowen at the next meeting.

The same gentleman is so far from subscribing to your Magazine, that he says he does not read it. Little as the gentleman reads of any book, I can assure you that he peruses it; in particular, I know that he got last November's, which, from recollection, I believe contained the account of Quail's disinterment. Our magistrates here thought that you might and should be prosecuted for Libel.

I remain, Gentlemen,
your sincere Wellwisher,

F.B.V

PRICES OF GRAIN, &c.

	s.	d.	s.	d.	
STRABANE, June 18, 1814.	Barley,.....	1	6	to	1 7 per stone.
	Oats,.....	11	to	1 1	per stone.
	Oatmeal,....	16	0	to	17 6 per cwt. of 120 lbs.
	Butter,.....	110	0	to	115 9 per cwt. of 120 lbs.
WATERFORD, June 18, 1814.	Wheat,.....	22	0	to	26 0 per barrel.
	Barley,.....	10	0	to	12 0 per bar.
	Oats, (com.)	9	0	to	0 0 per bar.
	... (potato)	10	0	to	0 0 per bar.
	Oatmeal,....	12	0	to	13 0 per cwt.
	Potatoes,....	2	to	3	per stone.
GALWAY, June 20, 1814.	Wheat,.....	10	0	to	12 0 per cwt.
	Ber,.....	6	0	to	6 3 per cwt.
	Barley,.....	11	4	to	13 0 per cwt.
	Oats,.....	5	0	to	6 0 per cwt.